



E

711

.S95

Author

Title

Imprint



1900  
W. Sulzer 10,000

W. F. R.

GOVERNMENT FOR THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII.  
THE LATE RICHARD PARKS BLAND.  
ELECTION OF SENATORS BY THE PEOPLE.  
SYMPATHY FOR THE BOERS.

---

## SPEECHES

OF

HON. WILLIAM SULZER,  
OF NEW YORK,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

April 4, 7, 12, and May 7, 1900.

---

WASHINGTON.  
1900.

E 711  
.S95

# SPEECHES OF HON. WILLIAM SULZER.

GOVERNMENT FOR THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII.

*Wednesday, April 4, 1900.*

The House being in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill (S. 222) to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii—

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This bill is intended to give a stable civil government to the Hawaiian Islands, and is entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii." Owing to the fact that nearly all my time for the past few weeks has been taken up by the investigation of the Idaho mining troubles now pending before the Military Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, I frankly confess that I have not had an opportunity to give this bill the study and the attention the importance of the subject under consideration deserves. From a superficial reading of the report submitted by the committee, and from a hasty analysis of the provisions of the bill, I believe, however, I can safely say that the bill now before the House is far from perfect and can be, and ought to be, materially improved by amendment.

I am informed that a number of amendments will be offered, and I indulge the hope that before the bill becomes a law the objectionable features it now contains will be eliminated and that the bill will be as nearly perfect as we can make it at the present time. These amendments should be adopted; and if they are, I trust this bill will pass.

Ever since the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to the United States I have favored granting to our fellow-citizens there the very best form of Territorial government it is possible for Congress to devise. They deserve it; they are entitled to it; and Congress should have vouchsafed them this important right long ere this. I favored and voted for the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands, and I gave my reasons for doing so at that time. I am now, and always have been, anxious to give the people there the best and the most liberal kind of Territorial government.

There is imperative need of early enactment of an organic act for the government of the Territory of Hawaii.

The joint resolution of July 7, 1898, providing for the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands, declares that the Hawaiian municipal laws not contrary to the United States Constitution or inconsistent with the terms of that resolution remain in force until Congress enact laws. It was undoubtedly expected then that a Territorial act would soon be passed, and a bill was introduced in each House of the Fifty-fifth Congress. But other matters of great national importance so occupied the time and attention of Congress that the bill was not passed.

Meanwhile it has become apparent that there is much doubt of the extent of the power granted to the local government of Hawaii by the provisions of the joint resolution, and in many important respects it has created something like an interregnum.

Many doubtful questions of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction have arisen, as well as of criminal procedure, rendering it uncertain whether there is now any tribunal for the decision of important questions affecting property and any existing method by which criminals may be indicted or legal juries impaneled for their trial.

In anticipation of Congressional action, the election to fill vacancies in the Hawaiian senate was not held last year, and there is, therefore, no legislative power for appropriating money for public purposes.

There is also grave doubt concerning the power of the Hawaiian government to grant franchises for industrial and commercial enterprises, or for railways which have been projected, and the Attorney-General of the United States has decided that the Hawaiian government has no power to grant or lease any of the public lands for homesteads or for any purpose, notwithstanding the fact that the treaty of annexation declared that the proceeds and revenues of such lands should be devoted to the benefit of the inhabitants of Hawaii.

In many respects the business affairs of the Territory are brought to a standstill. Many Americans have bought government land since annexation, on which they have built residences and planted crops, but their land titles are now in dispute and can not be settled until the passage of this bill.

Meanwhile Americans can not settle in Hawaii on homesteads or land bought from the government, and a very desirable class of citizens is thereby shut out of this new Territory. The local government is unable even to make public roads over any part of the public domain of Hawaii, or carry out plans based on legislation prior to annexation for widening and straightening the streets of Honolulu.

The presence in that city of the bubonic plague is calling for drastic measures by the Hawaiian authorities, involving the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars. In order to provide for these expenditures, and to compensate the owners of buildings which have been burned in the effort to suppress the pestilence, it is proper and just that a Territorial legislature be provided by Congress with no unnecessary delay.

Since the adoption of the resolution of annexation large numbers of Japanese contract laborers have been brought into the islands, and delay in extending the laws of the United States to them will be taken advantage of to increase the number.

This bill proposes a Territorial government for the Hawaiian Islands similar to that of the later Territories of the United States—a governor, a secretary, both appointed by the President; a treasurer, attorney-general, commissioner of public lands, commissioner of agriculture and forestry, superintendent of public works, superintendent of public instruction, auditor and deputy auditor, surveyor, and high sheriff, appointed by the governor.

A legislature is provided, consisting of a senate and house of representatives, elected by the people. The Territory is to be represented by a Delegate in Congress. The Territory is made a judicial district of the United States, with a district court having,

in addition, the jurisdiction of circuit courts, with a district judge, district attorney, and a marshal of the United States, appointed by the President, by and with the consent of the Senate of the United States.

The judicial power of the Territory is vested in a supreme court and in inferior courts to be established by the legislature. The laws of the United States locally applicable are extended over the new Territory, and the laws of Hawaii not inconsistent with the Constitution or laws of the United States are continued in force. The Territory is made a customs and revenue district and becomes subject to the tariff laws of the United States.

It needs no argument, it seems to me, to convince that if it be possible to give to the Hawaiian Islands a government like that of the United States Territories—a government which has met the approval of Congress and the American people since the Constitution was adopted and has proved itself adapted to the needs of a free and progressive people—it is desirable to do so.

Mr. Chairman, I am aware that there are many difficult problems to be solved regarding this legislation and that it will necessarily contain many errors and omissions; but, sir, I feel confident the citizens of the Hawaiian Islands will be able ultimately to solve the problems, and whatever defects this bill contains will soon be discovered when the law goes into operation, and time and experience and subsequent legislation will correct and remedy them. The all-important thing for us to do now, and do promptly, is to give the people of the Hawaiian Islands Territorial government, and the best, the freest, and the most liberal Territorial government the combined wisdom and judgment of Congress can devise. I am in favor of home rule and absolute local self-government for our Territories.

And, sir, I desire to say in this connection that what we do for the people of the Territory of Hawaii we should also do for the people of the Territory of Puerto Rico. There should be no selfish distinction—no sordid discrimination. A citizen of Hawaii is a citizen of the United States and a citizen of Puerto Rico is a citizen of the United States just as much as a citizen of the District of Columbia or a citizen of the State of New York; they are all citizens of the great Republic, free and independent, and under the dome of the Union sky, protected by the flag of our country, they are entitled to all the rights, to all the benefits, to all the privileges, and to all the immunities of the Federal Constitution. This is our plain duty, the imperative mandate of the hour, and for anyone or any party to seriously contend to the contrary is preposterous and in the end will be as unwise as it is unjust, as inhuman as it is indefensible, and as un-American as it is unconstitutional.

Any departure, in my judgment, by Congress from the well-settled, the successful, the time honored, and the constitutional policy of the Republic regarding the government of our territorial possessions will be fraught with much danger to our free institutions and will be a step forward in the contemplated programme of imperialism. I am opposed to any plan or any policy repugnant to or in any way antagonistic to the fundamental principles of our national existence. The Constitution is my guide, and the Declaration of Independence the lamp that illumines my path. I am opposed to injustice, to militarism, to imperialism, and to industrial slavery here or anywhere else, at home or in our islands of

the sea; and wherever our flag floats, in the Pacific or in the Atlantic, in the States or in the Territories, I want the Constitution to be there, guaranteeing to every human being liberty, equality, justice, and every right of an American citizen. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, this is all I desire to say at this time regarding the provisions of this bill. I shall vote for the amendments, and if they be adopted, I shall vote for this bill. But in connection with my remarks on this matter and some remarks I made a short time ago I wish to print in the RECORD some data in relation thereto that may be of interest to some of the thinking people of this country.

THE CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD some data in connection with his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

#### HON. W. J. BRYAN ON IMPERIALISM—JEFFERSON VS. IMPERIALISM.

The advocates of imperialism have sought to support their position by appealing to the authority of Jefferson. Of all the statesmen who have ever lived Jefferson was the one most hostile to the doctrines embodied in the demand for a European colonial policy.

Imperialism as it now presents itself embraces four distinct propositions:

1. That the acquisition of territory by conquest is right.
2. That the acquisition of remote territory is desirable.
3. That the doctrine that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed is unsound.
4. That people can be wisely governed by aliens.

To all these propositions Jefferson was emphatically opposed. In a letter to William Short, written in 1791, he said:

"If there be one principle more deeply written than any other in the mind of every American, it is that we should have nothing to do with conquest."

Could he be more explicit? Here we have a clear and strong denunciation of the doctrine that territory should be acquired by force. If it is said that we have outgrown the ideas of the fathers, it may be observed that the doctrine laid down by Jefferson was reiterated only a few years ago by no less a Republican than James G. Blaine. All remember the enthusiasm with which he entered into the work of bringing the republics of North and South America into close and cordial relations. Some, however, may have forgotten the resolutions introduced by him at the conference held in 1890, and approved by the commissioners present. They are as follows:

"First. That the principle of conquest shall not during the continuance of the treaty of arbitration be recognized as admissible under American public law.

"Second. That all cessions of territory made during the continuance of the treaty of arbitration shall be void if made under threats of war or in the presence of an armed force.

"Third. Any nation from which such cessions shall be exacted may demand that the validity of the cessions so made shall be submitted to arbitration.

"Fourth. Any renunciation of the right to arbitration made under the conditions named in the second section shall be null and void."

If the principle of conquest is right, why should it be denied a place in American public law? So objectionable is the theory of acquisition of territory by conquest that the nation which suffers such injustice can, according to the resolutions, recover by arbitration the land ceded in the presence of an armed force. So abhorrent is it that a waiver of arbitration made under such circumstances is null and void. While the resolutions were only for the consideration of the American republics, the principle therein stated can not be limited by latitude or longitude.

But this is a time of great and rapid changes, and some may even look upon Blaine's official acts as ancient history.

If so, let it be remembered that President McKinley only a year ago (December 6, 1897), in a message to Congress discussing the Cuban situation, said:

"I speak not of forcible annexation, for that is not to be thought of. That, by our code of morality, would be criminal aggression."

And yet some are now thinking of that which was then "not to be thought of." Policy may change, but does a "code of morality" change? In his recent speech at Savannah Secretary Gage, in defending the new policy of the Administration, suggested that "philanthropy and 5 per cent" may go hand



in hand. Surely we know not what a day may bring forth, if in so short a time "criminal aggression" can be transformed into "philanthropy and 5 per cent." What beauty, what riches, the isles of the Pacific must possess if they can tempt our people to abandon not only the traditions of a century, but our standard of national morality! What visions of national greatness the Philippines must arouse if the very sight of them can lead our country to vie with the monarchies of the Old World in the extension of sovereignty by force.

Jefferson has been called an expansionist, but our opponents will search in vain for a single instance where he advocated the acquisition of remote territory. On the contrary, he expressly disclaimed any desire for land outside of the North American continent. That he looked forward to the annexation of Cuba is well known, but in a letter to President Monroe, dated June 23, 1823, he suggested that we should be in readiness to receive Cuba "when solicited by herself." To him Cuba was desirable only because of the island's close proximity to the United States. Thinking that some one might use the annexation of Cuba as a precedent for indefinite expansion, he said, in a letter to President Madison, dated April 27, 1806:

"It will be objected to our receiving Cuba that no limit can then be drawn to our future acquisitions," but, he added, "Cuba can be defended by us without a navy, and this develops the principle which ought to limit our views. Nothing should ever be accepted which would require a navy to defend it."

In the same letter, speaking of the possible acquisition of that island, he said:

"I would immediately erect a column on the southernmost limit of Cuba and inscribe on it a ne plus ultra as to us in that direction."

It may be argued that Jefferson was wrong in asserting that we should confine our possessions to the North American continent, but certainly no one can truthfully quote him as an authority for excursions into the Eastern Hemisphere. If he was unwilling to go farther south than Cuba, even in the Western Hemisphere, would he be likely to look with favor upon colonies in the Orient?

If the authority of Jefferson can not be invoked to support the acquisition of remote territory, much less can his great name be used to excuse a colonial policy which denies to the people the right to govern themselves. When he suggested an inscription for his monument, he did not enumerate the honors which he had received, though no American had been more highly honored; he only asked to be remembered for what he had done, and he named the writing of the Declaration of Independence as the greatest of his deeds. In that memorable document he declared it a self-evident truth that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. The defense and development of that doctrine was his special care. His writings abound with expressions showing his devotion to that doctrine and his solicitude for it.

He preached it in the enthusiasm of his youth; he reiterated it when he reached the age of maturity; he crowned it with benedictions in his old age. Who will say that, if living, he would jeopardize it to-day by ingrafting upon it the doctrine of government by external force?

Upon the fourth proposition Jefferson is no less explicit. Now, when some are suggesting the wisdom of a military government for the Philippines, or a colonial system such as England administers in India, it will not be out of place to refer to the manner in which Jefferson viewed the inability of aliens to prescribe laws and administer government. In 1817 a French society was formed for the purpose of settling upon a tract of land near the Tombigbee River. Jefferson was invited to formulate laws and regulations for the society. On the 16th of January of that year he wrote from Monticello expressing his high appreciation of the confidence expressed in him, but declining to undertake the task. The reasons he gave are well worth considering at this time. After wishing them great happiness in their undertaking, he said:

"The laws, however, which must effect this must flow from their own habits, their own feelings, and the resources of their own minds. No stranger to these could possibly propose regulations adapted to them. Every people have their own particular habits, ways of thinking, manners, etc., which have grown up with them from their infancy, are become a part of their nature, and to which the regulations which are to make them happy must be accommodated. No member of a foreign country can have a sufficient sympathy with these. The institutions of Lycurgus, for example, would not have suited Athens, nor those of Solon, Lacedæmon. The organizations of Locke were impracticable for Carolina, and those of Rousseau for Poland. Turning inwardly on myself from these eminent illustrations of the truth of my observations, I feel all the presumption it would manifest should I undertake to do what this respectable society is alone qualified to do suitably for itself."

The alien may possess greater intelligence and greater strength, but he

lacks the sympathy for, and the identification with, the people. We have only to recall the grievances enumerated in the Declaration of independence to learn how an ocean may dilute justice and how the cry of the oppressed can be silenced by distance. And yet the inhabitants of the colonies were the descendants of Englishmen—blood of their blood and bone of their bone. Shall we be more considerate of subjects farther away from us, and differing from us in color, race, and tongue, than the English were of their own offspring?

Modest Jefferson! He had been governor, ambassador to France, Vice-President, and President; he was ripe in experience and crowned with honors; but this modern lawgiver, this immortal genius, hesitated to suggest laws for a people with whose habits, customs, and methods of thought he was unfamiliar. And yet the imperialists of to-day, intoxicated by a taste of blood, are rash enough to enter upon the government of the Filipinos, confident of the nation's ability to compel obedience, even if it can not earn gratitude or win affection. Plutarch said that men entertained three sentiments concerning the ancient gods: They feared them for their strength, admired them for their wisdom, and loved them for their justice. Jefferson taught the doctrine that governments should win the love of men. What shall be the ambition of our nation; to be loved because it is just or to be feared because it is strong?

#### THE LATE RICHARD PARKS BLAND.

*Saturday, April 7, 1900.*

The House having under consideration the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That the business of the House be now suspended in order that suitable tribute may be paid to the high character and eminent public services of the Hon. RICHARD PARKS BLAND, late a most distinguished member of the House of Representatives of the United States from the State of Missouri.

"*Resolved*, That as a mark of respect for the memory of the deceased the House, at the conclusion of these memorial exercises, shall stand adjourned.

"*Resolved*, That the Clerk of the House transmit a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased statesman and inform the Senate of the action of this body."

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. SPEAKER: With all that has been so eloquently and so affectionately said here to-day regarding the life and character of the late RICHARD P. BLAND I concur, and I would not be true to myself and to my friendship and admiration for him if I did not on this sad occasion place on record my humble tribute to his memory.

For years Mr. BLAND has been a prominent national figure and his name a household word. He had friends and followers and admirers in every hamlet and every State in the Union. His untimely death was a sad and terrible shock to us all, and to his country an irretrievable loss. When he died, the whole nation mourned and sympathized with his bereaved family, and the Republic lost as true and sincere a patriot as ever lived. He was a true man, a friend of the plain people, generous and forgiving, sincere and patriotic, honest and truthful, zealous and indefatigable in the cause of right and justice. For a quarter of a century he was a towering pillar of the Republic. The work he did is a part of the history of our country, and it is fitting and proper that his colleagues in this House should set aside a day to justly commemorate his name and fame. As the years come and go he will be better understood and more appreciated. Posterity will give him a higher place in the Temple of Fame, and future generations will pay his memory greater homage.

RICHARD PARKS BLAND was born near Hartford, Ky., on the 19th day of August, 1835, and died at his home in Lebanon, Mo., on the 15th day of June, 1899. He received an academic education. He was an unwearied student and an apt scholar. In 1855

he removed to Missouri and shortly thereafter to California, thence to that portion of Utah now Nevada, locating in Virginia City, where he practiced law for a time. He was interested in mining operations in California and Nevada; was county treasurer of Carson County, Utah Territory, from 1860 until the organization of the State government of Nevada; returned to Missouri in 1865; located at Rolla, Mo., and practiced law with his brother, C. C. Bland, until he removed to Lebanon, in August, 1869, and continued his practice there; was elected to the Forty-third, Forty-fourth, Forty-fifth, Forty-sixth, Forty-seventh, Forty-eighth, Forty-ninth, Fiftieth, Fifty-first, Fifty-second, Fifty-third, Fifty-fifth, and Fifty-sixth Congresses.

The work he did for the toilers of the land and the beneficent results he accomplished for struggling humanity during his long career as a member of this House must ever be a part of the imperishable history of the country, and the future historian impartially writing the legislative story of the last twenty-five years of the American Congress will place him in the front rank of constructive statesmen. That record is the heritage he left his countrymen and will be for all time to come the monument of his undying fame. It stands for absolute truth, exact justice, eternal principles, equality before the law, and equal rights for all.

He was no respecter of persons, no hero worshiper. He believed in humanity and trusted the people. He had faith in the greatness and the endurance of the Republic, and battled all his life to perpetuate our free institutions and hand them down unimpaired to future generations. He was a plain, simple man who loved his fellow-man. He was a believer in the fundamental principles that constitute our national existence and he trod the path of the patriot fathers. He was a disciple of Thomas Jefferson and struggled to keep the Government pure and in the control of the people. He turned his back on caste, combated privilege, and was the relentless foe of monopoly. He was a unique man in many ways. His nature was without guile; he hated cant, spurned pretense, and despised hypocrisy. He was the friend of the Constitution, and no argument, no sophistry, could persuade him from the path of duty. He did his works bravely and fearlessly in the face of obstacles that would appall a weaker and a more timid man.

In the great battle for the people's rights he never wearied, and the marshaled hosts of error never conquered him. Year in and year out he fought the good fight; he kept the faith. He lived truly, he thought truly, and he spoke truly. His life was as placid as a summer stream, and made him loved by all who knew him. His words uttered here for the defenseless were always respectfully listened to by admiring friends and doubting opponents, and were read and reread by innumerable millions. He spoke the truth for the countless who were robbed and oppressed for the enrichment and the benefit of the few, and he knew the truth would ultimately triumph and that his efforts for the rights of the people would sooner or later be crowned with success.

Think truly, and thy thought  
Shall the world's great famine feed;  
Speak truly, and each word of thine  
Shall be a fruitful seed;  
Live truly, and thy life shall be  
A grand and noble creed.

Such a man was RICHARD PARKS BLAND—a truly great, a truly good, a truly honest man in all things.

The great and immortal truths he uttered were not uttered in vain. They have borne and will continue to bear abundant fruit. His cause will live, and, in my opinion, the day is not far distant when the principles he contended for will be written on the statute books of America, an everlasting monument to his wisdom, his foresight, and his unerring judgment. The martyr dies; the cause survives. Man goeth to his long home, but his works live after him.

Mr. BLAND was a faithful public servant. He never betrayed a friend, a trust, or a principle. He always fought fair and open and aboveboard. He never resorted to trickery, to device, or to chicanery. He had no tricks of speech. He was a plain, blunt man, who never used words to conceal thoughts. He told the truth and told it in the simplest and most direct way. He went to the root of the subject. His heart was in all he did, in all he said, and he was great and eloquent and impressive because he was simple, honest, and sincere, and every word he uttered had the genuine ring of truth. He never despaired. He had the rectitude and patience of the rocks, the hope of the stream rushing to meet the ocean, the fidelity of the sun.

He believed in equal opportunity, encouraged worth, applauded manly effort, and wanted man to be free and stand erect. He was a great commoner: he sympathized with those who toil and struggle; he believed in the love of home, the sanctity of the hearthside, and his great responsive heart went out to comfort the sad, the sorrowing, and the disconsolate. He was the foe of tyranny, the enemy of bigotry, the eternal adversary of oppression. He was the champion of the masses, the friend of the downtrodden, the pioneer and the leader of the reform forces of the Republic against the serried ranks of the predatory classes.

Humanity was his constituency. to do good his political creed. He stood for the weak against the strong, for the lowly against the powerful, for the oppressed against the oppressor, for the right against the wrong, for truth against error, for every cause that lacked assistance, and, above all and beyond all, he stood, in all places and at all times, for the rights of man. When he died a great tree in the forests of the people fell and a great light in the Republic went out. We who follow after him, imbued with his noble example and inspired by his civic virtues, will heroically take up his burden, push forward his cause, and continue his fight until the battle is won and the mighty principles he contended for are forever triumphant. I believe if he were here to-day this would be his message, his wish to us, and that he would say to all as the poetess of America has so truly said to the world:

Let those who have failed take courage,  
 Though the enemy seemed to have won,  
 Though his ranks are strong, if he be in the wrong,  
 The battle is not yet done.  
 For sure as the morning follows  
 The darkest hour of the night,  
 No question is ever settled  
 Until it is settled right.

O man bowed down with labor,  
 O woman young, yet old,  
 O heart oppressed in the toiler's breast  
 And crushed by the power of gold,  
 Keep on with your weary battle  
 Against triumphant might,  
 No question is ever settled  
 Until it is settled right.

## ELECTION OF SENATORS BY THE PEOPLE.

*Thursday, April 12, 1900.*

The House having under consideration House joint resolution No. 28, proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of Senators of the United States—

Mr. SULZER said:

Mr. SPEAKER: The joint resolution now before the House and under discussion proposes to amend the Constitution so that Senators in Congress shall be elected directly by the people. I am in favor of the people electing United States Senators. Ever since I have been a member of this House I have worked faithfully to bring about this desirable reform. I introduced this joint resolution in the Fifty-fourth Congress, I introduced it in the Fifty-fifth Congress, and I reintroduced it the first day of this Congress. It passed this House by an almost unanimous vote in the last Congress, but failed to pass the Senate. For years, in Congress and out of Congress, in season and out of season, I have favored, discussed, and agitated this proposition. I believe it is right, I know the people favor it, and I hope every member of this House will now vote for it. The people all over this country demand this change in the Constitution and appeal to us to pass this resolution to give them this right.

This appeal is not sectional, nor is it partisan. It reaches us from all sections and from the different political parties with a degree of unanimity quite surprising and unaccountable, if not guided and impelled by a sense of righteous indignation, aroused by reports and accusations of alleged methods sometimes employed by gentlemen whose ambitions lead them to seek a seat in the Senate of the United States. We can well afford, indeed, as their representatives it is our bounden duty, to respect the wishes and do the will of the people and give them a uniform law allowing them by direct vote to elect their Senators.

It has been said that our action in passing this resolution will be useless and a waste of time, for the reason that the Senators will never consent to a change in the mode of their selection. That may be true in regard to some of the Senators, but I know it is not true in regard to all of them. Many of them favor this change and will advocate it. I know also that this resolution may fail this time, as it has failed to pass the Senate before, but those who believe in this change will not give up the struggle to bring it about, and sooner or later it will be adopted.

If a majority of Senators oppose the adoption of this resolution in this Congress and, from personal motives, mistaken ideas, or narrow-minded views, vote it down, the agitation of the people for this change will not cease, but will become more pronounced and more determined until there is a Senate that will respond to their wishes and enact legislation that will give the people the right to elect their United States Senators as well as their Representatives in Congress. Do not be deceived; make no mistake. This reform is growing more popular every year and is destined to come in the near future. I trust it will come this year and that the Senate will concur in the judgment of this House before this Congress adjourns.

In recent years there has been much scandal in several States regarding the election of United States Senators by the State legislatures. These scandalous elections are becoming more flagrant

and more frequent. The adoption of this amendment will prevent corruption, stop scandals, and to a great extent eliminate the temptation to gerrymander for partisan purposes.

Let me say to this House that this legislative gerrymandering has been carried further by the Republican party in my own State of New York than perhaps any other State in the Union. In the State of New York, under the present outrageous Republican apportionment, the people can not secure a Democratic legislature unless the Democratic party carries the State by at least a plurality of 100,000 votes.

The Republicans in their partisanship went so far that they wrote in our State constitution a provision that no matter what the population of Greater New York should be, no matter if it were twice as large as the population in the rest of the State, the city of Greater New York should never have more than one-half the members in the upper branch of our State legislature.

I believe the change in our Federal Constitution sought to be made by this resolution will almost entirely prevent these unfair and outrageous apportionments and at the same time give the poor man the same opportunity under the law as the wealthy one to submit his cause and his candidacy to the arbitration of the people for the high and honorable office of a Senator in Congress.

I favor this change in the Constitution, as I shall every other that will restore the Government to the control of the people. I want the people, in fact as well as in theory, to rule this great Republic and the Government to be directly responsible and immediately responsive to their will. I believe in the people, and I trust the people. In my judgment, the people can and ought to be trusted.

If the people can not be trusted, if they can be corrupted, coerced, influenced, or intimidated, then representative government is a failure and the free institutions of the Republic are doomed. We must rely on the people, and we should legislate at all times in their interest.

With the adoption of this amendment to the Constitution it will be impossible to defeat the will of the people, and the vacancies that are now too frequent in the Senate and occupy the time and attention of that body would never occur.

Mr. Speaker, there is a rapidly growing sentiment all over the country in favor of this change in the mode of electing Senators in Congress. It is a most important question to the people, and the Senate will make a sad mistake if it attempts to ignore it.

The legislatures of thirty-four States have formally indorsed this proposed amendment to the Constitution, and I firmly believe, if the Senate will now pass it, that every State in the Union will speedily ratify it, and it will become a part of the supreme law of the land. The people are in earnest in this matter, and any attempt to thwart their will in securing this reform will only hasten its consummation.

I am opposed to delegating away the rights of the people, and where they have been delegated I would restore them to the people. For one hundred years and more the distrust of the people by some of the founders of the Republic, as embodied in our Federal Constitution, has stood as fixed and immutable as the laws of the Medes and the Persians.

I am a friend of the Constitution and share in the patriotic sentiment which is prompt to challenge almost every proposition to

amend it. But, sir, I sincerely believe the man who would boldly point out the defects in our great Magna Charta and honestly seek to remedy them is a better friend of the Constitution than he who will not see its faults, or, seeing them, endeavors to justify them from motives of mistaken zeal.

The right to elect United States Senators by the people is a step in advance and in the right direction. I hope it will speedily be brought about. It is the right kind of reform, in the interest of the many and for the benefit of all the people, and its accomplishment will keep the Government nearer the masses and herald a better and a brighter day in the onward march of the Republic. [Applause.]

---

SYMPATHY FOR THE BOERS.

May 7, 1900.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules for the purpose of passing the following resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is out of order. The Journal has not been approved. Without objection, the Journal will be considered as approved. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

THE TWELFTH CENSUS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill H. R. 10696, an act relating to the Twelfth and subsequent censuses, and giving the Director thereof additional power to print in certain cases, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BINGHAM was recognized.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I thought I had the floor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York was not recognized.

Mr. SULZER. I understood that I had the floor and would be recognized as soon as the Journal was approved.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York was not recognized, and the Chair may as well state that the Chair will recognize no gentleman unless he has some knowledge of what is going to be called up.

Mr. SULZER. I would like to have the resolution read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has not been recognized.

Mr. BINGHAM. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 3537) to grant authority to change the name of the steamship *Paris*.

The Clerk read the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SULZER. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made by the gentleman from New York.

\* \* \* \* \*

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SULZER. I rise for the purpose of moving a suspension of

the rules, this being suspension day, for the purpose of passing a resolution sympathizing with the patriotic Boers in their struggle to maintain their freedom and independence.

The SPEAKER. The Chair declines to recognize the gentleman from New York at this time.

Mr. SULZER. Does the Chair refuse to recognize me because—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is out of order.

Mr. SULZER (continuing). The Speaker is opposed to the resolution?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will take his seat; the gentleman is out of order.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SULZER. My parliamentary inquiry is, Have I no rights on the floor of this House, as a member, to move a suspension of the rules on suspension day?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not making a parliamentary inquiry. The Chair must exercise his duty to this House and recognize members upon matters which the Chair thinks should be considered.

\* \* \* \* \*

Mr. MIERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER].

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, the measure now before the House is in the interest of the soldiers of the Union, and I am in favor of it and shall vote for the bill. I am now, always have been, and always will be a friend of the men who saved the Union, and I shall always favor the most liberal pension legislation in the interest of our heroic soldiers, their widows, and their orphans. I would make the pension roll a roll of honor to the friends of liberty and the brave defenders of our national existence. All glory, I say, to the brave men who fought for freedom in the dark hours from 1861 to 1865.

And, sir, in this connection I want to say all honor and all glory to the brave men who are now fighting for freedom and republican institutions on the veldts of South Africa. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I want to say a few words in favor of the Boers. I want the liberty-loving people of this country to know why official America refuses to sympathize with them in their struggle to maintain their independence. You Republicans stand up here and talk of freedom, of liberty, and about patriotism, but you dare not pass a resolution through this House extending sympathy to the liberty-loving and patriotic Boers of South Africa. Official America sneezes when Downing street takes snuff. Republicans, I dare you to permit this resolution in favor of the Boers to come to a vote.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. SULZER. I have only five minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAPRON). The gentleman from New York declines to yield.

Mr. SULZER. This morning—this being suspension day and the motion being in order—in accordance with the rules, in accordance with my rights as a member of this House, I moved to suspend the rules and pass the following resolutions:

*Resolved*, That we watch with deep and abiding interest the war between Great Britain and the South African Republics, and, with full determina-



tion to maintain a proper neutrality between the contending forces, we can not withhold our sympathy from the struggling people of the Republics, and it is our earnest desire that the Government of the United States, by its friendly offices offered to both powers, may assist in bringing the war to a speedy conclusion in a manner honorable to both Great Britain and the African Republics.

Now, sir, the Speaker, in violation of the Rules of this House and contrary to all parliamentary precedents, arbitrarily ruled my motion to suspend the rules and pass the resolution as out of order, and ordered me to take my seat. His action, as witnessed here this morning, clearly demonstrates that the Republican party is opposed to the Boers in their struggle to maintain their freedom and independence and is in secret sympathy with the Empire of Great Britain in its cruel, predatory, and rapacious war to devastate and exterminate the two little Republics of South Africa. The Speaker says he will not recognize a member of this House unless he knows in advance the purpose for which the member rises. If his position is right, then he is the House, and representative government is a farce. I protest against it.

Sir, actions speak louder than words; and the action of the Republican party in the White House, in the Senate, and in this House of Representatives proves, if it proves anything, that the President and the Republican party are opposed to the Boers and in favor of Great Britain. I read in a New York newspaper the remarks of Mr. Webster Davis, made to a New York audience last night, in which he said that President McKinley is a patriot and a grand American and was opposed to the robbery and the murder Great Britain was carrying on in South Africa, and that the President would do his duty.

I challenge that statement. It is not in accordance with the facts and the record. In my judgment, it is absolutely inconsistent with the truth. The Administration is not patriotic; it is not American. On the contrary, it is doing all that it can to suppress the honest expression of opinion in this representative body regarding the war in South Africa. Nine-tenths of the American people are in sympathy with the Boers, and they want Congress to pass a resolution sympathizing with them in their heroic struggle, but the Administration refuses to permit Congress to express its opinion.

The Administration is doing all it can against the South African Republics. It is doing all it can in favor of Great Britain. If it were a patriotic Administration, if it were truly representative of American sentiment, it would have followed the precedents of a century and extended its sympathy long ago to the Boers. We sympathized with Poland, with Hungary, with Greece, with Armenia, with all the South American Republics, with Cuba. Many we helped. Why, I ask in the name of all these precedents, in the name of all our glorious past, do we refuse to sympathize with the Boers?

Is it because England dominates the McKinley Administration? Is it because the Republican party has surrendered American rights to British interests? Is it because, officially, American sentiment is dead? This morning when the Speaker told me that he would not recognize me, that he would not permit the consideration of the resolution I offered, what a spectacle he presented! I felt sorry for him. No doubt he was simply obeying his orders from the White House or from MARK HANNA; but it is a spectacle that should make every friend of representative government blush with shame.

Just a word more. In my judgment Congress should act. Now is the time to do something. America should do its duty and do it at *once*. We must not wait. We should respond to the overwhelming sentiment of the country and pass a resolution extending our sympathy to our two brave little sister Republics of South Africa. The Boer peace commissioners are on the way here, and if we did this now we would not only be doing our duty, but what a grand welcome the news would be to them, and how it would enluse and encourage their struggling compatriots in South Africa. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.





0 013 788 356 9